

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/369,735	Applicant(s) MATSUI ET AL.	
	Examiner Maryam Monshipouri	Art Unit 1652	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Maryam Monshipouri. (3) _____.
- (2) Mr. Joseph Baker. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 September 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 8,14,28,30,31 and 33.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MARYAM MONSHIPOURI, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Baker indicated that hydrolysis of long alkyl chain beta-glycosides is a novel and non-obvious property of SEQ ID NO:2, which has only been discovered by the inventors. He also indicated that even though SEQ ID NO:2 was known in the prior art at the time of filing of this application the isolation of SEQ ID NO:2 was not obvious. However, the examiner did not find the former argument convincing because it was unclear as to how many carbons can be considered "long". In response to Mr. Baker's second argument the examiner mentioned that the non-obvious steps involved in isolation of SEQ ID NO:2 are not currently recited in any of base claims and may not even be relevant to its methods of use.